

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 LAURA LOOMER,
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 FACEBOOK INC.,
11 Defendant.

Case No. 20-cv-03154-HSG

12
13 **ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
14 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

15 Re: Dkt. No. 84

16 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Laura Loomer's motion to extend the time to respond
17 to Defendant Facebook, Inc.'s motion for summary judgment. *See* Dkt. No. 84. The Court has
18 several concerns with this motion specifically and the case more generally.

19 *First*, and most significantly, Plaintiff's counsel Larry Klayman still has not filed an
20 application to appear *pro hac vice* as required by Civil Local Rule 11-3. Instead, in the signature
21 block on the motion to extend time, Mr. Klayman indicates "Pro Hac Vice to be Submitted." *See*
22 *id.* at 2. But Mr. Klayman has had more than enough time to file a *pro hac vice* application.
23 Judge Rodney Smith transferred this action from the United States District Court for the Southern
24 District of Florida on April 13, 2020. *See* Dkt. No. 56. The Clerk of Court for the Northern
25 District of California reassigned the case to this Court on May 20, 2020. *See* Dkt. No. 65. And
26 the Court held a telephonic case management conference on July 7, 2020. *See* Dkt. No. 83. Mr.
27 Klayman may not practice in this Court without being granted permission to proceed *pro hac*
28 *vice*. Accordingly, before Mr. Klayman may file any opposition to the motion for summary
judgment (or any other document), he must first file and have his *pro hac vice* application
approved. The Court further cautions Mr. Klayman that his continued efforts to appear in this case
when he is not admitted to practice before this Court may subject him to sanctions for

1 unauthorized practice under Civil Local Rule 11-8.

2 *Second*, Plaintiff has styled this motion for an extension of time as a “consent motion,” and
3 indicates that “Defendants’ counsel consent to the requested relief.” *See* Dkt. No. 84 at 2. To the
4 extent the parties have agreed, the proper mechanism to request an extension of the briefing
5 schedule was a stipulated request for order changing time. *See* Civil Local Rule 6-2. The Court
6 therefore **DIRECTS** Defendant to confirm by August 6, 2020, at 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time whether
7 it “consented” to the summary judgment briefing schedule as indicated in Plaintiff’s motion.

8 *Lastly*, the Court strongly encourages all counsel to familiarize themselves with the Civil
9 Local Rules and this Court’s Standing Orders. The Court expects counsel to fully comply with the
10 applicable Local Rules and Standing Orders moving forward.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: August 5, 2020


13 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
14 United States District Judge